DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 858 EA 020 658

AUTHOR Griffiths, Daniel E.
TITLE Educational Administration: Reform PDQ or RIP. A UCEA Occasional Paper.
INSTITUTION University Council for Educational Administration, Tempe, AZ.
REPORT NO UCEA-OP-8312
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; Curriculum Design; *Educational Administration; Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Professional Education; Professional Recognition; *Schools of Education; *Specialist in Education Degrees; Theory Practice Relationship

ABSTRACT

This lecture addresses the conditions of educational administration as a profession, drawing on the speaker's experience in evaluating 37 colleges of education. The thesis is that a radical reform movement in the profession of educational administration is essential to the survival of the profession. Accordingly, the present condition of educational administration is analyzed, and several proposals are offered to improve the condition. These include: developing a bifurcated program in which administrators, professors, and researchers take their theoretical work together and then move into either a program for administrators or a program for professors and researchers; recruiting graduate students in educational administration from teachers with a demonstrated capacity for leadership; and sharing the responsibility for preparing administrators with the public schools. Next, five "strands" of a reformed educational administration curriculum are delineated: (1) the theoretical study of administration; (2) the technical core of educational administration; (3) solution of problems through applied research and the development of administrative skills; (4) involvement in supervised practice; and (5) demonstration of competence. The paper concludes with a summarized series of recommendations for upgrading the professional status of educational administration. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

A UCEA OCCASIONAL PAPER

ED303855

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION: REFORM PDQ OR RIP

Daniel E. Griffiths
New York University

#8312

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N Nash

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Ed 030 658

The University Council for Educational Administration
116 Farmer Building, Tempe, Arizona 85287-2211 (602) 965-6690

UCEA OCCASIONAL PAPERS

UCEA Occasional Papers are additional means of helping advance educational administration. The intent of this series of documents is to help exchange reports of ideas and activities more quickly than generally possible through conventional publications and journals.

The current series of Occasional Papers concentrates on information and insights that will be useful in the design and implementation of more effective professional preparation programs. If this approach to sharing ideas is productive, additional topics will be included in other series.

Each paper is expected to be no more than 25 to 30 pages, single spaced. Identification of sources for additional information about the topic is encouraged.

A decision on publishing a manuscript in the UCEA Occasional Papers series will be based on recommendations of panelists selected for their expertise relating to the topic. Four copies of each manuscript to be considered for inclusion in the UCEA Occasional Paper series are required. Only one copy will be returned to the author(s).

For further information, contact:

Editor, UCEA Occasional Papers
University Council for Educational Administration
116 Farmer Building
Tempe, AZ 85287-2211
Telephone: (602) 965-6690

A UCEA OCCASIONAL PAPER: # 8312

Educational Administration: Reform PDQ or RIP

by
Daniel E. Griffiths
Dean Emeritus
New York University

Invited Lecture
Division A, AERA
New Orleans
April 7, 1988

Permission is granted to reproduce all or any portion of this document for personal and classroom use, provided credit is given the author and UCEA. Additional copies of this paper may be obtained from the University Council for Educational Administration, 116 Farmer Building, Tempe, AZ 85287-2211

© 1988 The University Council for Educational Administration

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION: REFORM PDQ OR RIP[1]

This is my third Division A invited lecture. I marvel at your stamina. In previous lectures, I attempted to address theoretical issues in educational administration. In this one, I shall take as my topic the condition of educational administration as a profession and draw upon my recent experiences in addition to the literature. During the past ten years I have, with others, evaluated 37 colleges of education, during which time, I focused on departments of educational administration. I served for a semester as interim director of the University Council for Educational Administration, and was twice, in the past five years, a consultant to the National Graduate Student Research Seminar in Educational Administration which meets in conjunction with this convention. In addition, I was program chair for the 1985 AERA meeting. For the past two years I chaired the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. These and other related experiences have, I think, given me the opportunity to view educational administration from a unique perspective. When this is added to what we all know about the condition of public education as reported by commissions and the media, it leads me to the title of today's lecture, "Educational Administration: Reform Pretty Damn Quick or Rest in Peace." I am thoroughly and completely convinced that, unless a radical reform movement gets underway--and is successful--most of us in this room will live to see the end of educational administration as a profession.

I start by acknowledging the magnificent role educational administrators have played in building the public education system in America. Without our school system we could never have become an acknowledged world leader, but numerous changes in society, demography, culture, and in the education profession, have wreaked havoc with educational administrators.

One of the most insightful treatments of what the setting has done to educational administration is that of Fritz Hess (1983), Superintendent of Schools in East Syracuse, New York. He summarizes as follows:

> In the last analysis, the evolution of the practice of educational administration during the period

---

[1]I thank Dr. Patrick B. Forsyth, Executive Director of the University Council for Educational Administration for his help on this paper, particularly the section on departments of educational administration. I also thank Joyce K. McGuinness of New York University for her editorial assistance.

> 1959-1981 has been an evolution of roles. Sweeping alterations in American society, in student enrollments, in personnel, in regulation, in finance, and in technology have changed school executives from the leaders of an unquestioned institution to conflict managers and advocates in an intensely competitive environment. The transformation has been a dramatic one. It has been accompanied by considerable stress and dislocation. It continues to unfold in many areas, yet it has already encompassed trends that have totally reshaped the assumptions on which administrative practice in 1959 was based. (p. 245)

I shall first analyze the present condition of educational administration and then make several proposals designed to improve the condition. My analysis might seem unduly negative. This is so, not because I am naturally negative, but because stating the problem realistically often leads to a solution. Throughout, I shall draw heavily on Leaders for America's Schools: The Report and Final Papers of the Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (Griffiths, Stout, & Forsyth eds., 1988). When I think about the work of the Commission I am reminded of Oscar Wilde's aphorism, "On matters of grave importance, style, not sincerity, is the vital thing." The Commission was deeply concerned with style, but I shall be more concerned with sincerity.

My bottom line is that school administrators must be held accountable for the condition of American public education. I say this in spite of the fact that I am well aware that public education takes place in the context of an American society beset by numerous social problems, led by a president who has been comatose in regard to all social issues. The effort, in his final budget, to raise education funding by over a billion dollars reminds me of a repentant sinner on his death-bed. Further, the Secretary of Education uses his office as a bully pulpit while attempting to shift responsibility for funding education to the states and private enterprises. And also, the academic level of those entering teaching (and therefore administration) has never been lower. In spite of all this, school administrators are responsible. As Michael J. Murphy is reported to have said, it is the job of administrators to make bureaucracies work (Murphy, 1988). Certainly, in cases where school bureaucracies have been successful, superintendents and principals have not been reticent about taking credit. Those who take credit must also take blame.

And what is the condition of American public education for which administrators are to be held responsible? While in a quantitative sense (number of years of schooling per

child) American schools are very successful, and while there are exceptions to all generalizations, Finn's conclusion that "nearly everyone remains dissatisfied with the quality of our educational performance" (Finn, 1987, p. 63) is an accurate assessment of public education. Discontent is expressed across the board: businessmen, military officers, and college professors, all of whose opinions are reinforced by declining test scores and indicators such as those used by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). There is a lack of productivity in spite of the fact that, as Finn (1987) points out, "between the early 1950s and the mid-1980s, per-pupil expenditures in American public schools tripled in constant dollars. Yet . . . there was no gain in what the average student learned, and in many areas, knowledge and skills deteriorated" (p.64). In 1971, when the "real price" of schooling had only doubled in the previous 20 years, Kenneth Boulding addressed the AERA on the topic "The Schooling Industry as a Possibly Pathological Section of the American Economy" (Finn, 1987, p. 64). An industry with no commonly accepted criteria of success might well be termed "pathological." But the most awesome difficulty we have gotten ourselves into is "never in the history of Western democratic countries, which is to say post-18th century countries, have we had so large an illiterate class" (Himmelfarb, 1988).

And what of those who presumably lead the schools, the school administrators? The Governors' 1991 Report on Education, Time for Results, (1986), is quite clear in condemning them:

> Testimony at the task force hearings told us that the traditional organization of schools does not allow teachers enough time to prepare for instruction or review student work. Teachers have too few opportunities to build collegial relationships. School needs are not addressed systematically. Principals told us that expectations for them are not clear, that regulations require them to spend more time managing than leading, and that many principals are not trained to do what needs to be done. (p. 11)

And how do teachers feel about principals? A 1986 National Education Association (NEA) survey revealed that "fewer than one in six teachers viewed principals as effective sources of assistance with the knowledge and skills they need to do a better job of teaching" and "three of five teachers surveyed (60 percent) indicate that they don't receive enough advice, feedback or assistance from administrators" (National Governors' Association), 1986, p.54).

Achilles (1984) addressed the whole field of educational

administration and focused on the people who are administrators and those entering preparation programs. He agreed with Zeigler, who noted that superintendents were status quo oriented. Achilles commented:

> And this stance isn't surprising . . . . When most of today's superintendents were still classroom teachers . . . they were quiescent, conservative, and respectful of authority. Those who didn't accept these norms dropped out.
>
> Surviving male teachers, then, tended to become more politically conservative and to develop an unusually high need for respect, an exaggerated concern for authority, and a personal rigidity and fear of risk-taking behavior. (p. 128)

Up to this point the critics, while firm in their convictions, have been relatively calm. But when it comes to indicting the department of educational administration where administrators are prepared, the gloves come off.

Pitner (1982), in what is the best single, and most widely quoted review of preparation programs, summarizes school administrator attitudes towards their own preparation:

> Complaints about formal graduate studies in educational administration are legion among school administrators (Wolcott, 1973). Wolcott observes that principals appear to be unable to bring any special body of knowledge or set of unique skills to the position; they believe they perform adequately but they wish to perform exceedingly well. As a group, educational administrators disparage the utility of university training for preparing to face the problems of practitioners (Ourth, 1979). In a survey of 500 school districts, school administrators ranked the usefulness of college and university training low. Over half said they preferred the services of the state agency for assistance in professional development. Fewer than two percent of elementary school principals credit their success as school administrators to their graduate course work. (Department of Elementary School Principals, 1968)

Peterson and Finn (1985) castigated departments of educational administration for having "Mickey Mouse" programs, for following an arts and science model designed to prepare scholars rather than school administrators, for student "eased entry"--meaning low or no standards for admission, and for failure to include clinical experiences.

McCarthy (1988), in her study of professors of educational administration, reported that 80 percent were

tenured, 60 percent were full professors; female and minority appointees to professorial positions had increased in the past ten years, but the professoriate was still male-dominated. Although professors devote more time to research than they did 15 years ago, educational administration professors spend 40 percent less time doing research then do other professors. McCarthy documented the decline in size of departments by noting that for every two faculty appointments made in the last ten years, one position was lost. In spite of the criticism noted above and the fact that respondents reported they perceived curriculum reform to be the most critical present need, 85 percent rated their programs as good or excellent. McCarthy indicated deep distress at the complacency of the professoriate, as had Campbell and Newell a decade and a half earlier. The wonderment they expressed is as apt now as it was then: "One wonders how the study and training arm can be so pleased with itself while the practice arm of the profession is in such difficulty" (Campbell & Newell, 1973, p. 141). After discussing the decline in test scores for those entering teaching, Achilles quoted Sykes (1983) as to three trends:

> Those universities with high . . . academic standards will no longer have many students who wish to prepare for teaching . . . . Those institutions with open admissions will continue to train as teachers a large number of low-ability students who lack other options. Thus it seems probable that, in the future, a larger proportion of recruits to teaching will be low scorers who graduate from the most mediocre institutions . . .

I concur with Sykes on his observations and prediction. This is now happening. In one midwestern state the best program has the fewest students and the worst has the most students. Barbara Heyns (1988), in a study of teacher attrition, contends "those leaving teaching tend to have higher scholastic aptitude than those who remain" (p. 28). I also concur with Achilles (1984) in his prediction:

> Where does this leave educational leadership? Although I have not tested the following assertion, it seems worthy of consideration: If there is a declining quality among teachers, it will soon precipitate a similar decline in quality of educational leadership unless bold steps are taken. (p. 130)

One last blast from Achilles (1984):

> Higher education is far from blameless in this growing leadership problem. Many prestigious

> administrator preparation departments focus most of their energies on preparing researchers and professors for higher education. They expend much effort on doctoral programs. Few higher education institutions work diligently at developing exemplary principal/supervisor preparation programs. (Interestingly, this is the largest client group available to the universities!) Many seem satisfied with offering a whirlwind of courses that self-selected would-be-administrators can use to meet certification requirements, with little attention to prerequisites and sequencing. There are few full-time programs and scholarships or assistantships to help master's-level students enjoy the benefits of full-time study at the prestigious schools. Yet these institutions should concentrate on preparing people for the key positions of principal and supervisor, lest we have in administration the same problem identified earlier by Sykes of less able individuals graduating from the less prestigious schools. (p. 131)

The most damning critique is that of Hawley (1988) which I paraphrase. Most programs for training school administrators range in quality from embarrassing to disastrous. This is because most faculty are only marginally more knowledgeable than their students, admission standards are weak and performance criteria ill-defined. Uncertainty of purpose and lack of self-esteem among educational administration professors lead to low status in the school of education and the university; linkages to practitioners are weak, and few persons teaching in doctoral programs are qualified to supervise research.

History has taught us that society will accept failure from one of its institutions only to a limited extent and it then demands reform or replacement. So now the cries for drastic changes are heard. While reform is in the air, rumblings in the background say, "Throw the bums out!" After all, that's the American way. What are the rumblings? An accurate statement of the rumblings is found in a Thanksgiving Day Statement by a group of 27 Americans (1984):

> States should eliminate all requirements that school administrators must be former teachers, or that they must possess formal training in education per se. Instead states should be prepared to "certify" as school administrators men and women of diverse backgrounds who can demonstrate outstanding leadership potential, broad-based intelligence, and general understanding of organizational dynamics and educational processes. Such "demonstration"

> should take the form, initially, of tests, interviews, proof of prior leadership experience and other evidence of "likely" success. This examination should lead to an interim license that can be converted into a periodically renewable regular license upon at least one year's successful performance in a leadership role (or completion of a suitable apprenticeship). (p. 27)

I tended to scoff at this until I read the list of "Americans" and noted the names of outstanding school superintendents and professors of education. Further, New Jersey has, within the past month, adopted a certification plan that is almost identical to that advocated by the 27 Americans.

Then there is the Task Force Report of the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986), which supports Al Shanker's pet idea that:

> . . . schools (might be) headed by the lead teachers acting as a committee, one of whom acts like a managing partner in a professional partnership. In such schools, the teachers might hire the administrators, rather than the other way around. (p. 61)

So much for principals! And Carnegie doesn't even mention superintendents.

The Holmes Report saves its comments on administrators to the very end. In its penultimate paragraph it notes: "The existing structure of schools, the current working conditions of teachers, and the current division of authority between administrators and teachers are all seriously out of step with the requirements of the new profession" (Holmes, 1986, p.67). Not an elegant statement, but the intent is clear.

A major strategy in the work of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration was to come face-to-face with as many leaders of public education as possible. The main tactic was a series of six regional meetings, but there were many other meetings as well. All told, the staff met with some 1,400 people who hold what are called leadership positions. Virtually all these people were white and very few were women. With the exception of one meeting (Southeast meeting at Atlanta) the gatherings were dull and unproductive. We could not help wondering how well equipped the white, male, Anglo-Saxon leadership was to deal with a school population that is increasingly black, Hispanic, and Asian. How well can that leadership cope with the high tech competitive world in which we live? Then, of course, we should wonder how well equipped superintendents (97 percent male) and principals (80 percent male) are now, or have been,

to handle a student population that is 50 percent plus female, let alone an overwhelmingly female teaching staff. I am not making the argument that a doctor must have had appendicitis before being competent to remove an appendix, but there is sufficient evidence on the effect of gender differences of administrators and some evidence of majority-minority differences to indicate that school administrators should be more like the student population they serve than they are now.

There is then, pressure either to get rid of administrators as we now know them, or to take people untarnished by departments of educational administration. While this is the rumbling, the criticisms of present-day administrators and their preparation are loud and clear and the demand for reform is heard on all sides. While some of the criticism is overstated, and certainly all does not apply to everyone, I find the central thrust to be accurate, and, in fact, to coincide with what so many in the profession have been saying in private for years. However, I find many of the remedies to be worse than the disease and I am strongly in favor of reform rather than replacement of educational administration.

Needed Reforms

There are many indications of stirring, of change, in educational administration. They are a forerunner of necessary reform and, in fact, many of them will drive the reform movement. To mention a few, there are the following:

- The publication of the Handbook of Research on Educational Administration (Boyan, 1988). This book contains the basis for developing a common content for all university programs of educational administration.

- The work of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration which points out the needed reforms. The final report, Leaders for America's Schools: The Report and Papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, is due out in mid-May of 1988.

- The formation of the National Policy Board on Educational Administration, composed of all the national educational administration groups, hosted by the University of Virginia, and financed by the Danforth Foundation, the University, and the member associations. It is functioning under the leadership of Dave Clark. This Board is intended to monitor implementation of the recommendations of the Commission and give leadership to the reform

movement by issuing policy papers.

- The revitalization of the University Council for Educational Administration under the leadership of Patrick Forsyth. Sponsoring the Commission, the UCEA Convention, introduction of BITNET, and the national study of professors of educational administration are evidence of forward movement.

- The National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration is showing signs of life. Its change of name to National Council for Professors of Educational Administrators symbolizes new goals and direction.

- A major foundation, Danforth, is making sizeable investments in the improvement of educational administration.

- Some outstanding departments of educational administration are emerging.

I name Wisconsin, Utah, and Ohio State as three of the best. What more must be done? Frankly, all that is left is the hardest part.

Changing the Nature of Schools of Education

The key idea in the reforms advocated by the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration was best worded by President Derek Bok of Harvard in an article titled, "The Challenge to Schools of Education" (1987). Following a paragraph in which he pledged support to the Harvard Graduate School of Education, he wrote:

> The second aim must be to avoid the inferiority complex that has so often weakened education faculties and caused them to turn away from the schools in a misguided effort to win greater academic prestige. The history of schools of education strongly suggests that the way to achieve higher status in the academy is not to ape the standards of faculties of arts and sciences or simply to recruit professors who rank high in the parent academic disciplines. Such a course too often results in research far removed from the true needs of the schools and attracts professors who spend their time trying to work themselves back into arts and sciences departments. In order to win real respect without destructive consequences, a faculty must build a reputation based on its special competence in education. (p. 79)

After 18 years in the deanship I can vouch for the fact that President Bok is absolutely right. Schools of education, and particularly departments of educational administration, must turn back to the schools and establish relationships such as exist between professional schools in the university and their practitioners. We should be proud to become the professional backbone of the schools. Schools of education must become full-fledged professional schools, not pseudo arts and science colleges. We must, in educational administration, make the preparation of administrators our first priority and focus our research on achieving excellence in that endeavor.

Once we accept the idea that schools of education must become professional schools granting professional degrees, we can get squared away on the job of preparing professional school administrators. This idea is now attracting considerable interest: note Petersen and Finn (1985) , an article by Norton & Levan (1987), a book in press by Guthrie and Clifford, and Hoyle's speech at the AASA (1988).

The Education of Administrators

I am addressing the question of how administrators should be educated and I am not addressing the education of professors and researchers. I favor a bifurcated program in which those who wish to become administrators, professors, or researchers take their theoretical work together and then move into either a program for administrators or a program for professors and researchers.

Over the years, the education of administrators has been a matter of considerable controversy. The various concepts for thinking about educating administrators may be thought of as a continuum: philosopher-kings to administrative scientists to practical managers. Culbertson (1988) discussed, with obvious admiration, two philosopher-kings, William Harold Payne and William Torrey Harris. Both were teachers, principals, and superintendents before they assumed major national leadership roles and, while neither had received any formal training for their posts, were self-educated in speculative philosophy and related science. More recently Greenfield (Greenfield, 1982, p.7 quoted in Foster, 1988) advocated the study of history and law as appropriate disciplines for training administrators on the grounds they give "an awareness of the scope of human events and the pathos that accompanies them." I think we shall wait a long time before the legal profession shows much pathos. I also note the study of history was advocated in 1909 by Ellwood Cubberly, but that idea hasn't flown (Cubberly, 1909 quoted in Culbertson, 1988, p.9). One major result of the "theory movement" was the over-emphasis of theory and the belief that we, professors and administrators, could be scientific. But

the most prevalent mode of training was the preparation of practical managers. According to Callahan (1962), the extreme was Henry Linn of Teachers College at Columbia University, who devoted an entire class period to the cleaning of toilet bowls. The confusion as to how to educate administrators is not confined to education, but exists in other fields, particularly business administration. At root, the confusion results from widely differing views of the role of the administrator.

The Commission was deeply concerned with what it called "a vision of school leadership." It accepted the concept of school site management as the keystone in the restructuring of schools and as the basis for its concept of administration. This concept had its origin in the J. C. Worthy (1950) study of Sears, Roebuck and a few years later in the restructuring of General Electric (Drucker, 1973). They both stressed the need for what Drucker called "federated decentralization"--semi-autonomous units working under the loose direction of central headquarters. The idea was adapted to education in the mid-50s (Griffiths, 1956) and it has languished ever since. The best example is now to be found in Edmonton, Canada. Oh well, Paul Mort contended it took 50 years from the inception of an idea to full acceptance. We still have 12 years to go!

The Commission's version of school site management is that the principal, teachers, community members, and students would have the authority to jointly prepare the budget, select educational materials, hire, promote, and retain staff, buy the services of central office consultants, and develop programs. This, the Commission believes, would lead schools to become learning communities, foster collegiality, individualize instruction, and encourage involvement. It would shift resources, both material and human, from central administration to the individual schools where improved learning could take place. All this means a very different and more demanding role for the principal.

Superintendents of education must lead in the restructuring of schools, symbolize education in the community, be able academicians having the ability to recognize excellence in teaching, learning, and research, exercise the wisest kind of political behavior by resolving conflicting demands of many constituents, exercise skill in the managing of experts, be highly competent managers as they select staff, plan for the future, build the budget, and care for the school plant. Beyond all this, superintendents are the executive officers of school boards; they deal with the media, administer the union contract once they have helped to draw it, and they are skilled speakers, group leaders, negotiators and persuaders. Small wonder the Commission determined that what's needed are better candidates who have been better educated!

Recruitment and Selection. Bright people with proven

leadership potential must be attracted to the ranks of educational administrators. Presently, this is not happening. In fact, most programs have "open admission" with a baccalaureate degree as the only requirement. Those who enter educational administration are either self-selected (the vast majority) or tapped by superiors (a small, but significant number). The Graduate Record Examination (GRE) is the single best indicator of the mental ability of graduate students. Only three major fields have lower scores than do students in educational administration: physical education, social work, and home economics. In fact, of the 94 intended majors listed in Guide to the Use of the Graduate Record Examination Program 1985-86 (Guide, pp. 22-26) educational administration is fourth from the bottom. Certainly, the principalship and superintendency demand more in intellectual ability than is demonstrated by the current crop of students. Bad as these statistics are, it is astounding that Martha McCarthy could report that 85 percent of the professors said they had good students.

Careful recruitment and selection from the pool of teachers would result in graduate students in educational administration of much higher intellectual ability. A clue to the size of this pool can be found in the scores of education graduate students on the Graduate Record Examinations (GRE). About 35 percent of those students taking the GRE score above the mean on all three general tests: Verbal, Quantitative, and Analytical. Efforts should be made by boards of education, superintendents and principals, state education departments, and other professional organizations to induce these people to consider becoming administrators. Lest some think too much emphasis is placed on the intellectual criterion for educational administrators, they should be reminded that there are no recorded examples of good dumb principals or successful stupid superintendents.

In addition to the intellectual dimension, those wishing to become educational administrators should have demonstrated some capacity for leadership during their high school and college years. Those who were or are Scout leaders, team captains, or presidents of clubs or classes, should receive special attention. After all, the best predictor of whether people will become effective leaders is the fact that they have been successful.

Although there is no definitive research evidence that other characteristics are necessary attributes of a successful administrator, informed observers agree that certain characteristics are valuable. These include social skills, ability to speak and write clearly and persuasively, emotional maturity, adequate health, and decent character, as well as vision, an understanding of America's varied cultures, sensitivity to change, and motivation (Miskel, 1983). While no one should expect all administrators to

possess all of these qualities, it would be nice if they had some of them.

Since school administrators deal with an array of topics, subjects, and problems, they need to have good general education. If they do not have such a background, they should be required to take such arts and science courses as to give them good general education backgrounds prior to preparation for administration.

Enrollment of women in educational administration programs nation-wide is approaching 50 percent, a trend that should be encouraged. The next job is to get them appointed to principalships and superintendencies. The easiest, quickest, and surest way to improve the quality of educational administration is to appoint more women. On the other hand, enrollment of minorities in such programs has, on the whole, declined and is now established at two or three percent of the whole. Strenuous efforts should be made to recruit minorities into educational administration programs.

In summary, every program in educational administration should have extensive recruitment and intensive selection procedures. Students should be drawn from the upper 50 percent of scores on the Graduate Record Examination and should have displayed leadership in high school and college years and in their professional careers. Selection is far more important than most universities acknowledge. Training programs are not so powerful that they can make strong administrators out of people who lack intellectual and personal capabilities. The old saw is right, "You cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear."

The Program. Although it is recognized that an extremely high percentage (as high as 95 percent) of all graduate students in educational administration are part-timers, it is also recognized that this is one of the major reasons for many of the problems which afflict programs. Courses are not sequential, students do not develop an esprit de corps, do not use libraries, computer facilities and the like, do not develop close relationships with professors, and they do not have the opportunity to participate in field research projects. In short, they do not really experience the benefits and strengths of a full-time program.

Even though there are difficulties involved, the study of educational administration should be a full-time endeavor as it is in other professions and students should move through the program as a cohort. This happens now in school psychology, and since superintendents and principals receive higher salaries, it should be possible in educational administration. If the difficulties are too great, alternatives to full-time study should be developed which will guarantee the benefits which accrue to full-time students. Boston College, New York University, and the University of Alberta have made progress in this direction.

The responsibility for preparing educational

administrators should be shared with the profession and the public schools. Each should do what each does best. The university should provide the intellectual dimension of preparation. As March (1976) notes:

> Universities do as good a job as anyone at most aspects of management training. They do better at providing the basic knowledge, at identifying general problems, at isolating and providing broad experience in the necessary interpersonal and intellectual skills, at discussing value issues, at encouraging risk-taking and innovation, at building social and personal sensitivity, at exposure to conflicting ideas and sentiments, and at building a sense of self-esteem. (p. 118)

On the other hand the profession and the public schools are best at the clinical aspects of the program and should bear major responsibility for supervision of field activities, including the internship, and the solution of practical problems in university classes.

Planning for the program should involve both professors and practitioners. The program should be conceived in the framework of the professional school model, not the arts and science model, meaning that the program should prepare students to act, not merely think about administration. Clinical training should be stressed, without neglecting the intellectual aspects of preparation.

The program for preparing educational administrators should be all-university based, not offered exclusively in the department of educational administration. Universities are honeycombed with offerings in administration and with courses that can help students become better administrators. No department of educational administration in the world can match the resources of the total university. By using university offerings where appropriate, programs can be much richer than they are now. This idea has been viewed with a remarkable lack of enthusiasm by professors of educational administration. The leading professor in the country read it to mean, "Get the best possible students and send them to the 'B' School."

Speaking to the content of the program for preparing educational administrators, Peterson and Finn (1985) state unequivocally (as usual):

> . . . that today no [author's emphasis] set of competencies, experiences, and knowledge is commonly accepted as the core of any well-designed program of graduate study for future school administrators, such that imparting these became the key criterion for having one's training program approved and acquiring them becomes the main

> precondition for getting licensed to run a school or school system. (p. 55)

Research by Norton and Levan (1985), and my own observation, indicate their conclusion to be true. There is no agreement on what should be taught to prospective educational administrators (emphasis is mine). While I hope there is never any agreement on competencies, (in fact, we should forget that dismal approach to administrator education), there certainly should be agreement on experiences and knowledge. We now have the Handbook of Research on Educational Administration so ably edited by Norm Boyan. It should provide the research base for the reconstitution of curricula for preparing school administrators across the country. No longer should anyone say, and get away with it as does Al Shanker, that our programs have no content. We have the content--now we must use it.

Let me remind you that the research we now have includes the effects of gender differences and that this information should be an integral part of any curriculum revision that is undertaken (Shakeshaft, 1986).

Needless to say, the latest technological developments in teaching should be used. Advanced computer simulations, computers, films, and recordings should all be employed.

The program should be comprised of five strands or themes. Just how these strands are handled could well vary from university to university since the thrust of each strand can be realized in many different ways. With the exception of the last strand, demonstration of competence, all others can be taken concurrently since the strands are not conceived as sequential. Courses within each strand, however, should be sequential. Some of the relevant courses might well be taken in other schools in the university, or professors from other parts of the university might be induced to teach in the department of educational administration. The discussion of each strand is given here for illustrative purposes only.

Strand I. The Theoretical Study of Educational Administration.

While administration is the performance of actions, these actions have an intellectual and value basis which is found in administrative science, the behavioral sciences, philosophy, and experience. Since the fields of study are vast, it is necessary to choose and construct courses with a focus on administration. Simply sending a student to a graduate course in sociology or philosophy is not likely to contribute much to an administrator.

Course work in administrative theory should include the study of what is now considered traditional: social systems, decision-making, contingency theory, bureaucracy, and the Barnard-Simon equilibrium theory. Equal attention should be given to the new theories and approaches to understanding

organizations. In addition, the exploration of a variety of new metaphors for thinking about organizations and such ideas as paradigm diversity would be useful (Burrell & Morgan, 1980).

Strand 1 should also give attention to the broad underlying issues which confront educational administrators, such as: the nature of the curriculum, moral and ethical issues, how to deal with children with AIDS, the minority question, poverty in society, and the changing nature of American society. These issues might be dealt with in a cohort seminar taught by a multidisciplinary faculty using the case method.

This strand also includes work in the behavioral sciences which could be handled on an individual basis with students taking courses in sociology, psychology, economics, or anthropology as indicated by their background.

Strand II. The Technical Core of Educational Administration.

Every profession has a core of technical knowledge which must be possessed by its practitioners. Educational administration is no exception. It too, has a core of technical knowledge with which the educational administrator must be familiar. (Note: I did not say "master" or "be an expert in." Most superintendents and principals have staff people who are experts in the various aspects of the technical core.) The superintendent and principal need to know enough of that core to be able to direct and monitor the work of others who are, presumably, experts. March (1974), in his Cocking Lecture of 1973, discusses in considerable detail the management of expertise. Having an understanding of the technical core is one aspect of that ability. (Also see Griffin, 1988).

Most programs have one or more courses in each aspect of the core such as school finance or law. It would make more sense if a single course of a year's duration were constructed to incorporate the whole core and be taught from the orientation of managing experts in each core area. The components of the course would include: supervision of instruction, curriculum building and evaluation, finance, law, personnel, school-community relations, pupil personnel, physical facilities, and school business management.

Because the principal and superintendent must both be consummate educational politicians and negotiators, they should be held for at least one course in politics of education, and one in negotiations. The latter should not merely be a "book" course, but should include supervised practice in negotiating.

Strand III. Solution of Problems Through the Use of Applied Research and the Development of Administrative Skills.

This strand would be taught both at the university and in the schools. The problems might well be posed through the

vehicles of computer simulations, cases, and filmed incidents, as well as actual problems in the schools. Successful school administrators should be employed as adjunct professors to aid in the instruction. The students would be taught how to solve problems through the use of both quantitative and qualitative research methods, as well as decision-making techniques. The substance of the problems should include ethics, values, human relations, curriculum, school-community relations, finance, and in-school problems such as use of drugs, teenage pregnancies, and emotionally disturbed children.

Probably more school administrators fail because of poor skills than any other single reason, yet program and faculty in educational administration fail to do anything about it. It's as though a baseball team in spring training gave the player books to read and lectures on the theory of baseball and did not have the player practice hitting and fielding. Administrators have to perform, and in order to perform well they must have the basic skills of administration. These include: talking, writing (memos, announcements, public relations, releases), conducting meetings of various sizes, conducting interviews, computer literacy, negotiating, supervising teachers, working with the board of education.

It is recommended that each educational administration department establish an administrative skills center, in which students are tested on these skills. If found lacking, they would be tutored to reach the desired level of performance. No academic credit would be granted for remedial skills development. The skills center could take several forms depending on the resources available. In some instances the center would be administrative only, contracting with appropriate parts of the university for needed remediation; in other cases it would be a physical site staffed with specialists. The former is a more likely choice.

Strand IV. Involvement in Supervised Practice.

This strand could well be the most critical phase of the administrator's preparation. The student would start clinical experience almost from the first day of graduate study. Beginning with observations of school board meetings and administrators in action, the student would move through a series of short, special-purpose internships with master administrators. A feeling for administration would be developed through these experiences, building a background out of which later problems would be solved. The clinical experiences might well be organized by a university professor, but the students should be supervised by top administrators from outstanding public schools.

Strand V. The Demonstration of Competence.

The culminating set of experiences would not result in a

research thesis, as is now the practice. Rather, it would be a demonstration that the student has really learned something about performing as an administrator. This could be demonstrated through a large computer simulation, a field test, or through handling a large case. In addition, an individual or group field study would be required.

The student should be expected to demonstrate a philosophy of education and administration, sensitivity to people, and awareness of ethical values, as well as technical competence.

The Professional Doctorate

The question now arises as to the nature of the academic degree that should be given for the programs discussed. Given that virtually all administrators will have been teachers and will have a master's degree in their teaching field, the degree should be a doctorate, based on three years of full-time study. The master's degree in educational administration should, therefore, be dropped. We recognize that (depending on who does the counting) between one-third and one-half of the superintendents now have a doctoral degree. Since the proposed program is heavily clinical and resembles professional doctoral programs in dentistry, medicine, and psychology, the degree awarded should be a professional doctorate.

The original idea of the EdD was that it would be education's professional doctorate. The problem is that we professional educators have so bastardized the EdD, that one university's EdD is another's PhD and vice versa. A very respectable professional doctorate, whether it be called an EdD or by some other name, could be built on the recommendations made. I believe that such a degree would, after a time, be accepted in the university. In fact, the university expects professional schools to have their own doctorates and has expressed alarm at the present state of affairs. The attempt by professional educators to develop a pseudo arts and science degree has been met with scorn in most universities. It's high time we built what is appropriate and expected: a professional doctorate.

Professors and Departments

And now to the crux of the matter: how might the vitality and intellectual climate of departments be enhanced? First, it is essential that the notion of department leadership as temporary and reluctant service must be discarded as an anachronism. To quote Forsyth (1987):

> "Departments are not romantically conceived clusters of eccentrics governed by benevolent

> anarchy. The creation of a dynamic, effective setting for the study of schools and the preparation of school administrators is not a chance happening. Scholars who reluctantly serve as chairs are unlikely creators of the appropriate setting; election by peers does not often result in strong sustained leadership." (pp. 10-11)

In fact, within UCEA, 50 percent of chairs are in the first three years of service (Norton, 1987). The elected rotating chair is one democratic governance practice that should be dropped at once.

- The practice of combining educational administration with other programs resulting in artificial administrative units has gone too far. Norton (1988) studied 58 departments, and found only 19 exclusively in educational administration. The other 39 contained as many as nine major academic areas. In UCEA, there are 63 different thrusts in department of educational administration. Michigan State wins the prize with a department composed of educational administration, higher education, multicultural education, foundations, classroom learning, guidance, adult and continuing education, curriculum specialties, and generic education.

  The motto seems to be--you name it, we got it. I suppose it's possible to rationalize almost any organizational structure, but aside from financial reasons, how can such departments be justified? We must get back to departments that are educational administration, or are at least administration and closely related fields.

- The intellectual climate of the departments need tending. The knowledge base of educational administration was borrowed from the theory and research of the social sciences. Unfortunately, it never evolved into a unique knowledge base informing the practice of school administration. Unlike engineering research, which is often focused on specific problems of practicing engineers, the research done by scholars in educational administration has followed the methods and organization of sociology. Like the sociologist, the researchers in educational administration have chosen to study schools and administrations as they exist without examining the methods, possibilities, and consequences of professional intervention or standards of practice.

- A knowledge base must be developed, organized around problems of practice, that includes administrative intervention and its consequences for teaching and learning. This implies the embrace of new research methods, information retrieval/display systems, and taxonomies of practice. Also implied are new partner relationships (schools and universities) for the collection, storage, retrieval, and analysis of information related to the professional practice of school administration. Contingent on these changes is the development of instructional materials, texts, and clinical learning opportunities consistent with the preparation of adult learners for the informed practice of school administration.

- Technological developments require that professors rethink their primary responsibilities such as the dissemination of professional knowledge. Computers, and the network potential they afford, have important implications for what professors do, how they do it, and with whom they do it. Schools and departments of educational administration should establish computer networks to exchange knowledge, problems, and information. Administrators, professors, researchers, graduate students, and teachers can be effectively linked together to pose and address the complex problems of schooling. The constraints of time and restricted information have been dissolved by technological advance.

- The Commission believes a quality program requires a minimum of five full-time faculty members (the median number of educational administration faculty in UCEA members is 6.4 contrasted with 3.7 in non-UCEA departments), graduate assistants, first-rate instructional materials, sophisticated technologies, and a cohort of highly qualified students.

  In 1973, the authors of a major study of professors of educational administration were perplexed by the complacence of professors in the face of recognized problems with administrator preparation, particularly the poor intellectual climate of the department (Campbell & Newell, 1973). Today, complacence continues to be characteristic of those professors (McCarthy, Kuh, Newell, & Iacona, in press). Fewer and older, they are faced with insufficient resources and small enrollments; they are less able and probably less

disposed to improve administrator preparation than in 1973. Another concern expressed in the 1973 study was the dismal quantity and quality of research in educational administration; this has not improved appreciably.

- Without abandoning the belief that professional preparation is, at best, an intense, prolonged, and rigorous experience, we must push at the constraints and find new ways to deliver high quality preparation to worthy candidates. Proceeding through programs as a cohort, students should experience the university community as dynamic, that is, professors should be conspicuous and available; journal clubs, guest scholars, research projects, and debate should be evident. Colleges of education must work to restore a cadre of research and graduate assistants to the department. A recent study of UCEA departments revealed only six with graduate assistants.

  School districts must share responsibility for administrator preparation. Sabbaticals, paid fellowships, released time, and intern sponsorship are ways districts can assure themselves and the profession of a superior pool of administrator candidates. The revival and expansion of university based, school study councils can provide relevant part-time employment for students within the university environment. Cooperative programs between the state department of education and the university can provide an enriched preparation program combining salaried responsibilities in the state department with continuous residency with the university. (Note the University of Texas--Teacher Education Agency program (Valverde, 1988). In short, aggressive efforts can win the resources to make administrator preparation full-time academic and clinical work.

- Departments and schools must give new attention to the development needs of individual professors as well. Budget restrictions of the last decade have had a depressing effect on development opportunities as the professorate has grown older and less mobile. Travel to professional meetings and support for research, two of the primary developmental avenues, have all but disappeared at many universities. A combination of old and new approaches may meet current needs: services to improve instruction, sabbaticals, exchange programs, retooling opportunities, career development services, and fellowship programs.

- Probably the most destructive trend has been the increasing amount of time spent by professors of educational administration in private consulting. Educational administration professors have always spent a lot of time consulting. But it seems that this practice is increasing. The university or even the state college provides the home base as the professor roams freely!! No wonder they are complacent!!! Business is fine--and the program has gone to hell. The Commission recommends that consulting be controlled by the university. There is a great need for departmental sponsorship, assignment, and quality control of consulting activity.

  In addition to learning about schools through consulting it should not be too difficult to work out arrangements whereby professors of educational administration work as principals or in other administrative roles while incumbents are ill or on sabbatical. Professors should stay relevant by doing administration in the public schools.

- New mechanisms are needed to stimulate and disseminate changes in research methods and focus. For example, an academy for the advanced study of school administration might bring together professors and practitioners for summer programs. And the nation's top educational administration scholars could refocus research through the dissemination of new procedures for studying organizations and administrator intervention.

- We should stop our silly arguments as to whether we should be positivists or critical theorists or subjectivists, or whatever. Strictly speaking, it is impossible to research social problems using positivism as set forth by the Vienna Circle and the critical theorists in education have yet to produce any research at all. I like the advice of Jelinek, Smircich, and Hirsch (1983) which I paraphrase:

  We need to understand organizations in many different ways, they must be viewed from many vantage points. When viewed from a single set of assumptions much of the organization is not accounted for. Our thinking should not be monochromatic, but should rather be like "a coat of many colors" encompassing varied assumptions, analogies, metaphors, and theories." (p. 331)

- I was disheartened to read Pajak's (1988) rebuttal

to Schneider & Ogawa: "It (drama) may be the only metaphor that can adequately place the prevailing mechanistic metaphor in its proper place" (p.8). Certainly, we don't need any more arguments about the one true theory or metaphor. We need to solve problems, not fight about theories. I agree with whoever said it first, "What difference does it make if a cat is black or white as long as it catches the mouse?"

My advice to the researcher in educational administration is to work with the schools to isolate problems of real significance and then use whatever theory is needed to solve the problem. For support I look to two Harvard professors: Paul Hanus (1910) who said, ". . . it seems clearer and clearer than ever that the way to study school administration is to study school administration and not to study the social and philosophical sciences . . ." and Hilary Putnam who argued that "science is now simply a term for the successful pursuit of knowledge." And by studying school administration I mean more than counting how many phone calls a principal makes or how many people are spoken to in a day. The question is, as Gronn (1982) has reiterated, what do principals say and with what result? Studies such as those done by McPherson (1985) who shadowed four education officers in Australia, and Kit Wood (1987) at Arizona State who hung microphones on school principals and analyzed what they said are what we need.

- The preparation programs must have intellectual vigor, high standards of practice, and a challenging faculty who are themselves active scholars, valued consultants, and exciting mentors. Departments of educational administration must be vibrant intellectual communities active in research that will change practice.

- The message of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration to presidents and vice-presidents is very clear: <u>Universities unable to accept the spirit of excellence described in this report should cease preparing administrators</u>. There are 505 institutions offering courses in school administration in the United States, but less than 200 have the resources and commitment to provide the excellence called for by the Commission. Because it is concerned about the great number of individuals being prepared and licensed in programs

with inadequate resources and little commitment to quality, the Commission recommends that the campuses prepare fewer better. Like other professional programs, an excellent one in educational administration will have fewer students and require greater university support. Only institutions willing to support such excellence should continue to support school leaders. University leadership needs to join with that of state governors, expressed in their report, Time For Results, "to focus resources and energies on a limited number of excellent administrator preparation programs."

Conclusion

While the condition of educational administration is serious it is not hopeless. Several positive moves are underway: the initiation of the National Policy Board on Educational Administration, the final report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, the support of the Danforth Foundation, and the revitalization of the UCEA. As professors of educational administration the next steps are up to us. Each department or program should:

- Establish strong ties with the public schools.
- Adopt the professional model for our schools of education and departments of educational administration and junk the arts and science model.
- Make programs all-university in nature.
- Improve recruitment; bring in better students.
- Adopt a modern conception of educational administration.
- Greatly improve our research and at the same time revise programs to include it.
- Improve our theories and use them to improve research.
- Rebuild our departments of educational administration and fund them at meaningful levels.

If all this is too much for you, stop preparing educational administrators. As my favorite president, Harry Truman said, "If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen."

References

Achilles, C. (1984). Forecast: Stormy weather ahead in educational administration. Issues in Education, II(2), 127-135.

Bok, D. (1987, May, June). The challenge to schools of education. Harvard Magazine. p. 76.

Boyan, N. (Ed.). (1988). Handbook of research on educational administration. New York: Longman.

Burrell, G. & Morgan, G. (1979). Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis. Exeter, NH: Heinemann.

Campbell, R. & Newell, L. (1973). A study of professors of educational administration. Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration.

Callahan, R. (1962). Education and the cult of efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Author.

Clifford, G. & Guthrie, J. (In press). Education schools: A brief for professional education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Culbertson, J. (1988). A century's quest for a knowledge base. In N. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of research on educational administration (pp. 3-26). New York: Longman.

Department of Elementary School Principals. (1968). The elementary school principalship in 1968. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association.

Drucker, P. (1974). Management. New York: Harper.

Educational Testing Service. (1985). Guide to the use of the Graduate Record Examination Program. Princeton: Author.

Finn, C. (1987). Education that works: Make the schools compete. Harvard Business Review, 87(5), 63-68.

Forsyth, P. (1987, November). Revamping the preparation of school administration. Paper presented at the Southwest

Educational Development Laboratory Conference, Albuquerque, NM.

Foster, W. (1988). Educational administration: A critical appraisal. In D. Griffiths, R. Stout, & P. Forsyth, Leaders for America's schools: Final report and papers of the National Commission on Exellence in Educational Administration. San Francisco: McCutchan.

Greenfield, T. (1982). Against group mind: An anarchistic theory of organization. McGill Journal of Education 17(1), 3-11.

Griffin, G. (1988). Leadership for curriculum improvement: The school administrator's role. In L. Tanner (Ed.), Critical issues in curriculum (pp. 244-266). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Griffiths, D. (1956). Human relations in school administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Griffiths, D., Clark, D., Wynn, D., & Iannaccone, L., (1962). Organizing schools for effective education. Danville, IL: Interstate.

Griffiths, D., Stout, R., & Forsyth, P. (Eds.). (1988). Leaders for America's Schools: Final report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. San Francisco: McCutchan.

Gronn, P. C. (1982). Neo-Taylorism in educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly. 18(4), 17-35.

Hanus, P. (1910). Editorial notes. School Review. 18, 426-427. Cited in Culbertson, J. (1988), A century's quest for a knowledge base. In N. Boyan, Handbook of research on educational administration. New York: Longman.

Hawley W. D. (1988). Universities and the improvement of school management: Roles for the states. In Leaders for America's schools: Report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. San Francisco: McCutchan.

Hess, F. (1983). Evolution in practice. Educational Administration Quarterly4, 19(3), 223-248.

Heyns, B. (1988). Educational defectors: A first look at teacher attrition in the NLS-72. Educational Researcher, 17(3), 24-31.

Himmelfarb, G. (1988, January 14). Tall orders. New York Times, p. 1 (Section 4).

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing: Author.

Hoyle, J. (1988, February). The 21st century superintendent: A great motivator. Paul B. Salmon Memorial Lecture at theAmerican Association of School Administrators, Las Vegas.

Jelinek, M., Smircich, L., & Hirsch, P. (Eds.). (1983). Organizational culture. Administrative Science Quarterly 28(3).

March, J. (1974). Analytical skills and the university training of administrators. The Journal of Educational Administration. 1,(8), 30-54.

March, J. (1976). Analytical skills and the university training of educational administrators. In J. Herring and R. Hymes, (Eds.). Walter D. Cocking Lectures: The NCPEA Series of Prominent Papers in Educational Administration. Berrien Springs, Michigan: Center for Studies and Services in Education.

McCarthy, M. (1988). The professoriate in educational administration: A status report. In D. Griffiths, R. Stout, and P. Forsyth (Eds.). Leaders for America's schools: The report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. San Francisco: McCutchan.

McCarthy, M., Kuh, G., Newell, L., and Iacona, C. (1988, in press). Under scrutiny: The educational administration professoriate. Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.

MacPherson, R. (1985). Some problems encountered Boswelling elite educational administrators. Canadian Administrator, 24 (2).

Miskel, C. (1983). The practicing administrator: Dilemmas, knowledge, and strategies for improving leadership. In W. Hird, (Ed.), The practicing administrator: Dilemmas and strategies. Brisbane: Barden Professional Development Center.

Murphy, M. (1988). Alternatives for educational administration: Lessons from abroad. In D. Griffiths, R. Stout, and P. Forsyth (Eds.), Leaders for America's schools: Final report and papers of the National

Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. San Francisco: McCutchan.

National Governors' Association. (1986). Time for results. Washington, DC: Author.

Norton, M. (1987) A study of the department chair in educational administration. Tempe: Arizona State University.

Norton, M. (1988). A national survey of departmental organization in educational administration. In D. Griffiths, R. Stout, and P. Forsyth, (Eds.). Leaders for America's Schools: Final report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. San Francisco: McCutchan.

Norton, M. and Levan, F. (1985). Doctoral studies of students in educational administration programs in UCEA member institutions. Tempe: University Council for Educational Administration.

Norton, M. and Levan, F. (1987, winter). Doctoral studies of students in educational administration programs in UCEA member institutions. Educational Considerations, Vol. 14(1),

Orth, J. (1979, March). Have our universities failed us? National Elementary Principal 59(3).

Pajak, E. (1988, January). A response by Pajak. Dialogue. pp. 7-8.

Peper, J. (1988). Clinical education for school superintendents. In D. Griffiths, R. Stout, and P. Forsyth (Eds.). Leaders for America's schools: Final report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. San Francisco: McCutchan.

Peters, T. & Waterman, R., Jr. (1982). In search of excellence. New York: Harper and Row.

Peterson, K., & Finn, C. (1985, Spring). Principals, superintendents, and the administrator's art. The Public Interest,(79), 42-62.

Pitner, N. (1988). Training of the school administrator: State of the art. In D. Griffiths, R. Stout, and P. Forsyth,(Eds.), Leaders for America's schools: Final report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. San

Francisco: McCutchan.

Putnam, H. (1978). Quoted in B. Magee, Men of ideas (pp. 233- 234). New York: Viking.

Shakeshaft, C. (1988). Women in educational administration: Implications for training. In D. Griffiths, R. Stout, and P. Forsyth, (Eds.), Leaders for America's schools: Final report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. San Francisco: McCutchan.

Sykes, G. (1983). Contradictions, ironies, and promises unfulfilled: A contemporary account of the status of teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 87-93.

A Thanksgiving Day Statement by a Group of 27 Americans (1984). Developing Character: Transmitting knowledge. Posen, IL: ARL Services, Inc.

Valverde, L. (1988). An exemplary preparation program: The cooperative superintendency program of the University of Texas at Austin. In D. Griffiths, R. Stout, and P. Forsyth, (Eds.), Leaders for America's schools: Final report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. San Francisco: McCutchan.

Wolcott, H. (1973). The man in the principal's office: An ethnography. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Wood, K. (1987). Principal talk: Patterns of communication behavior. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, Tempe.

Worthy, J. (1950). Organizational structure and employee morale. American Sociological Review, 15, 169-179.

ABOUT UCEA

The University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) is a nonprofit corporation whose members are major universities in the United States and Canada. A number of school districts are also affiliated with UCEA.

History

In 1954, members of the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (Middle Atlantic Region) proposed an organization which would be devoted to improving the professional preparation of educational administrators. To help establish such an organization, a central office with part-time staff was established on the campus of Columbia University, financed by a grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation to Teachers College of Columbia.

Between 1956 and 1959, with the help of the staff at the Teachers College office, UCEA's constitution and by-laws were formulated, the organization's purposes were defined, and additional financial support was obtained in the form of a five-year grant from the Kellogg Foundation. The UCEA central office moved to The Ohio State University in 1959 and a small, full-time staff was hired. In 1984 the central office was moved to its present location on the campus of Arizona State University.

Since its inception, the Council has worked to improve the professional preparation of administrative personnel in both continuing education and pre-service programs. UCEA has been a major contributor to:

1. Broadening the content of preparation programs for educational administrators.
2. Extending use of more effective methods of inquiry to educational administration.
3. Shifting educational administration from an anecdotal orientation to a more scientific one, leading to generalizations about organization and leadership.
4. Developing new instructional materials for administrator programs.
5. Fostering exchanges in research and in program development between professors and administrative leaders in the U.S. and their counterparts in other countries.
6. Continuing efforts toward standards of excellence in research and in preparation programs for administration.

More recently, the Council also has focused considerable attention on strengthening relationships between institutions that prepare administrators for service and the school districts and other agencies in which administrators serve. The major means to accomplish this has been the UCEA University and School District Partnership described later in this document.

UCEA GOALS AND ACTIVITIES

UCEA engages in a variety of activities and produces a number of publications and instructional materials. All these activities and products proceed from a basic set of goals sufficiently stable to give the organization identity, yet flexible enough to respond to changing conditions in educational administration.

Goals

Briefly stated, UCEA goals are:

- To advance understanding in all areas relating to educational administration and to enhance the research capability of participating institutions.
- To develop better methods of instruction, new materials, and other approaches to help bring about more effective pre-service and staff development programs for all professionals in educational administration.
- To create more effective pathways and networks for exchanging new understandings and better methods among persons working to advance educational administration.

Program Activities

A representative sample of the many types of activities sponsored by UCEA follows:

- Inter-institutional research projects on such subjects as principalship effectiveness, education policy, and managing resources.
- Articulation of new directions for research and training--for example, in formulating research perspectives, in preparing leaders to anticipate the future, and in establishing criteria for administrator certification.
- Development and testing of training programs for administrators that make effective use of resources in other disciplines--for example, strengthening the humanities in administrator preparation programs.
- Professional renewal opportunities for member institutions--for example, seminars and workshops on subjects such as methods of research, preparing leaders for the future, and coping with the challenges of urban education.
- Involvement of graduate students from member institutions in professional seminars, institutes, and conferences and in research and development projects.
- Creation of new organizations--the UCEA University and School System Partnership and the Inter-American Society for Educational Administration.

Publications

- **Educational Administration Quarterly** (established in 1965), a journal containing conceptual and theoretical articles, research analyses, and reviews of books in educational administration.
- **Educational Administration Abstracts** (established in 1966), a journal produced through the cooperative efforts of UCEA institutions containing brief summaries of articles from approximately 140 professional journals.
- **Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership** (first published in 1981), a periodical devoted to consideration of equity-related educational needs of Hispanics, Blacks, American Indians, Asian-Americans, women, and other groups.
- **UCEA Review**, an in-house periodical that provides up-to-date information on UCEA activities and news from member universities and Partnership school districts.

In addition, UCEA regularly aids in the production and distribution of a wide range of books, monographs, special reports, and other media.

Instructional Materials

UCEA is especially concerned with the need to develop instructional materials that will improve administrator preparation programs. A number of simulations have been developed for this purpose, including the "Monroe City" urban simulation, developed and demonstrated in various parts of the U.S. and Canada by more than 180 professors from 40 universities. The most recent UCEA training tools is the Adams Simulation, which contains five simulations of administrative positions in a suburban school district.

uc ea
The University Council for Educational Administration
116 Farmer Building, Tempe, Arizona 85287-2211 (602) 965-6690